

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

James P. Walsh, CSB. No. 184620  
Gwen Fanger, CSB No. 191161  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800  
San Francisco, California 94111-3611  
Telephone: (415) 276-6500  
Facsimile: (415) 276-6599  
budwalsh@dwt.com

Attorneys for Defendants and Claimant  
BARRY COHEN, CHRIS COHEN (aka CHRISTENE COHEN), the F/V POINT LOMA and  
Claimant, F/V POINT LOMA Fishing Company, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

DEL MAR SEAFOODS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARRY COHEN, CHRIS COHEN (aka  
CHRISTENE COHEN), *in personam* and,  
F/V POINT LOMA, Official Number  
515298, a 1968 steel-hulled, 126-gross ton,  
70.8 foot long fishing vessel, her engines,  
tackle, furniture apparel, etc., *in rem*, and  
Does 1-10,

Defendants.

No. C-07-2952-WHA

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO  
SHORTEN TIME FOR HEARING  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER LIMITING  
DEPOSITION OF CHRISTENE  
COHEN PURSUANT TO FRCP 26(c)**

**Date: January 3, 2008**

**Time: 8:00 a.m.**

**Place: Courtroom 9, 19th Floor**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-3 and 7-11, Defendants, Barry A. Cohen and Chris Cohen,  
the vessel F/V POINT LOMA and its owner, the F/V Point Loma Fishing Company, Inc.  
(collectively "Defendants"), hereby apply for an Order Shortening Time ("Motion to Shorten  
Time") for hearing their Motion for a Protective Order Limiting the Deposition of Christene  
Cohen Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) (the "Motion for Protective Order"). Defendants seek a  
protective order allowing Plaintiff, Del Mar Seafoods, Inc. ("Del Mar") to pose no more than 15

interrogatories in writing to Christene Cohen in lieu of taking her deposition, which has been scheduled for January 11, 2008 in Scottsdale, Arizona.

### INTRODUCTION

As set forth in detail in Defendants' Motion for Protective Order, Defendants request a hearing for a protective order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) limiting the deposition of Christene Cohen. Plaintiff has noticed the deposition of Mrs. Cohen for January 11, 2008 in Scottsdale, Arizona, where Mrs. Cohen currently resides, without conferring with Defendants. Defendants oppose this deposition and have filed a Motion for Protective Order. However, the earliest possible date to schedule a hearing on the protective order under the Rules is January 24, 2008. This date is well beyond the discovery cut-off deadline of January 11, 2008. Thus, Defendants respectfully request that the court grant their Motion to Shorten Time and hear arguments on January 3, 2008 before the expiration of the discovery period.

### ARGUMENT

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6-3, Defendants respectfully request an Order Shortening Time on the grounds set forth below.

1. Reasons for shortening time. The timing of the discovery period necessitates this Motion to Shorten Time. The deadline for the close of discovery is January 11, 2008. This is also the date for which Plaintiff noticed the deposition of Mrs. Cohen to take place in Scottsdale, Arizona. The date that Plaintiff gave notice of the deposition was December 6, 2007. Declaration of Gwen Fanger in Support of Defendants' Motion to Shorten Time ("Fanger Dec."), Ex. A. The earliest date for a hearing on the Motion for Protective Order under the Rules is January 24, 2008. With the hearing date noticed for January 24, 2008, absent an earlier hearing, the parties could not resolve the issue prior to the close of discovery. Fanger Dec. ¶5.

2. Defendants' efforts to obtain stipulation for shortening time. On December 17, 2007, Defendants sent Plaintiff a letter indicating their intention to seek a protective order and requesting that Plaintiff agree to a hearing on January 3, 2008 in light of the upcoming deposition and discovery cut-off date. See Fanger Dec., Ex. D. Plaintiff responded that it rejected

1 Defendants' request and would not consent to a hearing date on January 3, 2008. Fanger Dec.,  
2 Ex. E.

3 3. Substantial harm and prejudice will occur. Defendants will incur substantial harm  
4 and prejudice if the Motion to Shorten Time is not granted. See Fanger Dec. ¶7. Plaintiff has  
5 noticed the deposition of Christene Cohen, the wife of Barry Cohen, to take place in Scottsdale,  
6 Arizona on the last day of discovery. Mrs. Cohen can not afford to miss work to have her  
7 deposition taken. In addition, as explained in part 4 below and in the accompanying Defendants'  
8 Motion for Protective Order, the deposition raises the risk of disclosure of confidential  
9 information protected by both the marital communications privilege and the attorney client  
10 privilege. Moreover, as described in the Motion for Protective Order, Plaintiff itself recognizes  
11 that Mrs. Cohen has had not business dealings with Del Mar that are the subject of this lawsuit.  
12 If the hearing date on Defendants' Motion for Protective Order cannot be changed to fall within  
13 the discovery cut-off period, Defendants will not have the opportunity to seek a protective order  
14 prior to the close of discovery. Plaintiff on the other hand will have sufficient time to respond to  
15 the Motion for Protective Order if the Order to Shorten Time is granted. Fanger Dec., ¶9

16 4. Defendants' attempts to resolve dispute regarding deposition of Mrs. Cohen.

17 Pursuant to L.R. 37-1(a), Defendants have attempted to resolve the dispute regarding the  
18 unnecessary burden and expense in taking the deposition of Christene Cohen. Plaintiff noticed  
19 the deposition of Mrs. Cohen for January 11, 2008 in Scottsdale, Arizona prior to conferring with  
20 Defendants as to Mrs. Cohen's availability. The date of the deposition is noticed for a Friday that  
21 Mrs. Cohen is working on and for which she can not take time off. Moreover, most, if not all, of  
22 Mrs. Cohen's testimony regarding her marital relationship with Mr. Cohen and her private  
23 communications with him are protected from disclosure under both the California and federal  
24 common law privilege for marital communications not to mention the attorney-client privilege  
25 related to her divorce proceedings. Plaintiff's speculation regarding the Cohens' marital  
26 relationship is irrelevant to the whether Plaintiff had a right to foreclose on the Ship Mortgage. In  
27 addition, based on the deposition testimony of Del Mar's president and controller, Del Mar's  
28

1 exclusive dealings regarding the issues in this case were with Barry Cohen and not his wife.  
2 Moreover, Mrs. Cohen has no knowledge of the subjects of this lawsuit (amounts owed under the  
3 Note and Mortgage) and the counterclaim for wrongful arrest of the Vessel. Thus, Mrs. Cohen's  
4 deposition testimony would be significantly limited to *relevant*, non-privileged information, if  
5 any, and would not justify the personal burden to her or the expenses to all the parties involved in  
6 flying to Arizona to take her deposition.

7 In an effort to minimize the burden and cost to all parties, and in light of the risk of  
8 disclosing privileged communications between her and her husband, on December 12, 2007,  
9 Defendants proposed an alternative where Plaintiff could pose a reasonable number of written  
10 interrogatories to Mrs. Cohen, even though Plaintiff already exceeded the number of allowable  
11 interrogatories under Fed. R. Civ. P. 33. *See Fanger Dec., Ex. B.* Although Plaintiff proposed  
12 splitting the cost of flying Mrs. Cohen to San Francisco to have her deposition taken, she cannot  
13 take time off of work to travel and this proposal does not relieve the burden to her. *See Fanger*  
14 *Dec., Exhibit C.* Moreover, Plaintiff has not heeded this court's admonition to keep costs down  
15 and the deposition of Mrs. Cohen is just one of Plaintiff's six irrelevant and unnecessary  
16 depositions it has noticed in this case (four of which are non-parties, including Barry Cohen's two  
17 sons, the captain of the Vessel, and Barry Cohen's personal accountant.).

18 5. There have been no previous modifications of time in this case.

19 The Court has granted no other orders allowing modification of time in these proceedings.

#### 20 CONCLUSION

21 For these reasons, Defendants respectfully request the court grant Defendants' Motion for  
22 Order Shortening Time.

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

1 DATED this 18<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2007.

2  
3 Respectfully submitted,

4 /s/ James P. Walsh  
5 James P. Walsh (CSB No. 184620)

6 Attorneys for BARRY COHEN, CHRIS  
7 COHEN, F/V POINT LOMA and the F/V  
8 POINT LOMA FISHING COMPANY, INC.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP